

Application No. 09/921,097
Reply dated January 22, 2008
Reply to Office Action of November 26, 2007

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-6, 8-21, 23-33, 35-45, 47-56, and 59-70 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,017,173 to Armstrong et al. ("Armstrong"); and rejected claims 7, 22, 34 and 46 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Armstrong in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,154,738 to Call ("Call").

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Applicant's independent claims 1, 16, 31, 43, and 55 each recite a method that includes "interrupting the delivery of the video to the client application at a point in time after the interacting with the interface link." Independent claim 59 recites a method that includes "interrupting the delivery of the video to the client application in response to the interacting with the link program." Armstrong does not disclose or suggest such methods.

Armstrong teaches that "the provider equipment wait for an indication of content interruption from the subscriber (e.g., a stop or pause command)." (Armstrong, col. 13, 11-13). In Armstrong, "the provider equipment continues to stream the requested content to the subscriber until a command is received from the subscriber via the back channel (BC) indicating that streaming should be stopped." (Armstrong, col. 13, lines 13-16). Armstrong further teaches that "[a]fter receiving a content interruption command, the method 600 proceeds to step 608" where "the advertisement objects associated with the provided content are displayed on the user's presentation device." (Armstrong, col. 13, lines 17-21).

As shown in FIG. 6 of Armstrong, the "content/advertising display with selectable advertising objects" is provided to the user at step 608 after the requested content has been interrupted (i.e., paused) at step 606. Accordingly, the delivery of the video to the client application (i.e., set top box) in Armstrong is interrupted at a point in time before the advertisement links are displayed on the user's screen and before the advertisement links can be interacted with by the user. Armstrong does not disclose or suggest "interrupting the delivery of the video to the client application at a point in time after the interacting with the interface link" as recited in independent claims 1, 16, 31, 43, and 55. Similarly, Armstrong does not disclose or suggest "interrupting the delivery of the video to the client

Application No. 09/921,097
Reply dated January 22, 2008
Reply to Office Action of November 26, 2007

application in response to the interacting with the link program" as recited in independent claim 59.

Applicant submits that independent claims 1, 16, 31, 43, 55, and 59 are novel over Armstrong. It is submitted that the Examiner's rejection of claims 1-6, 8-21, 23-33, 35-45, 47-56, and 59-70 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Armstrong has been overcome. Claims 7, 22, 34 and 46, dependent from Independent claims 7, 16, 31, and 43, respectively, are novel and non-obvious over Armstrong in view of Call at least due to their dependency from an allowable independent claim.

Applicant submits that independent claim 1, 16, 31, 43, 55, and 59 are patentable and that dependent claims 2-15, 17-30, 32-42, 44-54, 56, and 60-70 dependent from independent claim 1, 16, 31, 43, 55, and 59, or claims dependent therefrom, are patentable at least due to their dependency from an allowable independent claim.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant submits that the claimed invention is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious in view of the prior art references cited against this application. Applicant therefore requests the Examiner's reconsideration and reexamination of the application, and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

To the extent any extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is required to obtain entry of this reply, such extension is hereby respectfully requested. If there are any fees due under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17 which are not enclosed herewith, including any fees required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, please charge such fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-1068.

Respectfully submitted,

MARTIN & FERRARO, LLP

Dated: January 22, 2008

By: 

Amedeo F. Ferraro
Registration No. 37,129

1557 Lake O'Pines Street, NE
Hartville, Ohio 44632
Telephone: (310) 286-9800
Facsimile: (310) 286-2795